

## **SOUTH DAVIS COUNTY TRANSIT DEIS**

### **Centerville Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3 - Summary**

**Project:**

South Davis County Transit DEIS

**Meeting Purpose:**

Centerville Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3

**Meeting**

6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
August 23, 2007

**Location:**

MTC Building

---

**Attendee**

Angelo Papastamos  
Kerry Doane  
Kim Clark  
Jacqueline Jensen  
Saffron Capson  
Colleen Lavery  
Robin Hutcheson  
Sherri Lindstrom  
Tamilyn Fillmore  
Cory Snyder (representative)  
Ken Jones  
Phil Sessions  
Jim Petersen  
Dave Gill  
Kathy Helgesen

**Representing**

UDOT  
UTA  
VIA  
H.W. Lochner  
H.W. Lochner  
Carter & Burgess  
Fehr & Peers  
Sub-Committee member  
Sub-Committee member  
Sub-Committee member  
Sub-Committee member  
Sub-Committee member  
Sub-Committee member  
Sub-Committee member

**Meeting Summary:****Process**

K. Clark began by explaining where the project currently is in the overall process. She indicated alternatives for the project are currently being evaluated. Input from the next round of sub-committee meetings will be used to accomplish this task. During the next regional workshop attendees will focus specifically on alignments. During the current meeting the focus will be on alternative modes. The Purpose and Need Statement for the study was reviewed with the group. Sub-committee members were referred to their meeting packets for full text copies of all of the meeting materials..

**Regional Workshop Recap**

K. Clark recapped the exercise conducted at the second Regional Workshop which focused on origins/destinations, alignments, and the identification of modes. A map of the primary and secondary alignments identified at the Regional Workshop was shown to the group.

### Universe of Alternatives

K. Clark explained what the “universe of alternatives” entailed and the Universe of Alignments map was shown. Sub-committee members were then taken through the two components to an alternative (alignment and mode).

### Alignments

A map of preliminary alignments being taken through the alternatives analysis process was shown to sub-committee members as the study’s preliminary “long list alignments.” K. Clark reviewed the criteria used to narrow down alignments.

### Modes

Next, a “universe of modes” list was reviewed with the sub-committee members. As with alignment narrowing criteria, mode narrowing criteria was discussed. The preliminary “long list of modes” was outlined by K. Clark. The list was divided into two categories – bus and rail.

### Factors to Consider

K. Clark defined factors to consider when comparing modes. Factors included market, capacity, operating characteristics, costs, environmental/community considerations, and access. After each factor was reviewed, a “dot game” exercise was conducted to determine which three factors are most important to each sub-committee member in considering modes. The following is a list of factors identified by the Centerville sub-committee members as most important when considering modes:

Category	Factors	Number of Dots
Market	Local trips are important.	1.5
	Commuter trips are important.	2.5
Capacity		0
Operating Characteristics	It should stop frequently.	1
	Minimal travel time.	2
Costs		2
Environmental/Community Considerations	It needs to sit within the context of my community.	4
	It needs to allow for good traffic flow.	4
Access	It needs to be easy to board.	0
	I need to be able to get to it easily.	6

### Long List Modes

R. Hutcheson outlined each mode in the preliminary long list of modes, including giving a description and typical characteristics based on how the mode has been implemented in other communities in the United States. After each mode was discussed, the group participated in an exercise to determine the “pros” and “cons” of implementing each mode in their community. Below is a list of pros and cons identified by Centerville sub-committee members.

BUS (2 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Integrates with traffic	Stigma
Potential for less right-of-way impacts	Reliability
More frequent stops	
If you use two different roadways for directional service, there would not be need for feeder service	
Ability to have multiple alignments (on different roadways) with staggered schedule. Reduces the need for a secondary route.	

BRT – Bus Rapid Transit (2 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Attractive	Impacts of dedicated lane
Pedestrian access	Unattractive perception
Higher frequency	Inflexible perception
Faster	
No wires	
Integrate with traffic	
Signal priority	
Potential park and ride lots	
Flexible	
Cost	
Bypass traffic problems	
Could be modified to LRT (fixed BRT)	
If you use two different roadways for directional service, there would not be need for feeder service	
Ability to have multiple alignments (on different roadways) with staggered schedule. Reduces the need for a secondary route.	

LRT – Light Rail Transit (0 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Good for commuters	Electric wires
Changing lifestyles (community context)	No park and ride lots for LRT in Centerville
Good for development	Transfer required
Can expand easily (north)	Higher cost
Attractive to riders	

Streetcar (3 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Attractive	Doesn't serve commuters
Brings pedestrians to the area (pedestrian access)	5 mile limitation isn't compatible with Centerville
Can serve local and commuter traffic (modern upper-level)	
Economic value compared to LRT	
Flexible with trips	
Cost compared to LRT	

DMU – Diesel Mobile Unit (0 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Potential for less right-of-way impacts	Environmental impacts
	On the west side of the freeway

Notes: Main Street is important to Centerville. The impact to Centerville is much different than impacts to other South Davis communities because of the bottleneck. Centerville would like to find a balance between traffic and transit.

### Future Meetings

The next sub-committee meeting will be held on October 18<sup>th</sup> from 6:00–8:00 p.m.

Any discrepancies with this meeting summary, please notify Jacqueline Jensen.

Cc: Attendees, Project Contact List, Centerville Sub-Committee Members